

## REMARKS

Reconsideration of the application in view of the following remarks is respectfully requested.

Claims 1, 2, 8, 11 and 12 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Inai et al. "Doped Channel HFET . . ." (Supplied in IDS #5). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Applicants' invention, as reflected in amended independent claims 1 and 11, is directed to a field-effect semiconductor device comprising, *inter alia*, a channel layer; and a contact layer; a semiconductor structure having a first junction face between the semiconductor structure and the channel layer and having a second junction face between the semiconductor structure and the contact layer; wherein the first junction face between the channel layer and the semiconductor structure and the second junction face between the contact layer and the semiconductor structure are iso-type heterojunctions.

In contrast, Inai et al. discloses a DC-HFET with an iso-type heterojunction, i.e. an n-AlGaAs/i-AlGaAs/n-GaAs. In contrast, applicants' invention is reflected in claims 1 and 11 and specifies an iso-heterojunction like n-AlGaAs/i-AlGaAs/n-AlGaAs shown in Fig. 4 and discussed in the specification at page 8, line 23 to page 9, line 3.

In view of the foregoing, it is clear that Inai et al. does not anticipate applicants' invention as reflected in claims 1 and 11. There is not a suggestion in Inai et al. of using a semiconductor structure of an iso-type rather than a semiconductor structure which is an iso-type. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that claims 1 and 11 are not rendered obvious by Inai et al.

Claims 3-7, 9 and 10 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Inai et al. Since claims 3-7, 9 and 10 are dependent either directly or indirectly from claim 1, it is respectfully submitted that these claims are patentable for the same reasons, as well as because of

the combination of the features set forth in these claims with the features set forth in the claim(s) from which they depend.

Claims 2 and 8 depend either directly or indirectly from claim 1 and claim 12 is dependent from claim 11. Accordingly, these claims are patentable for the same reasons as claims 1 and 11, as well as because of the combination of features set forth in these claims with the features set forth in claim(s) from which they depend.

In view of the foregoing, this application is now believed to be in condition for allowance, which action is respectfully requested.

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as First Class Mail in an envelope addressed to: Asst. Commissioner for Patents, Washington, D.C. 20231, on August 19, 2002:

Martin Pfeffer

Name of applicant, assignee or  
Registered Representative

Signature

August 19, 2002

Date of Signature

MP:mcm

Respectfully submitted,

Martin Pfeffer

Registration No.: 20,808

OSTROLENK, FABER, GERB & SOFFEN, LLP

1180 Avenue of the Americas

New York, New York 10036-8403

Telephone: (212) 382-0700